

On the existence and multiplicity of solutions for discrete higher order BVP

Mikołaj Peplowski

November 23, 2011

Abstract

We investigate the existence and multiplicity of solutions for higher order discrete boundary value problems via critical point theory.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the discrete boundary value problem of order $2n$ with Dirichlet type boundary conditions, namely we investigate

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^n(p(k-n)\Delta^n x(k-n)) + (-1)^{n+1}f(k, x(k)) &= 0 \text{ for } k \in Z[1, N] \\ x(i) &= 0 \text{ for } i \in Z[1-n, 0] \cup Z[N+1, N+n] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $N \geq 2$; $f \in C(Z[1, N] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$; $p(i) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1-n, \dots, N$; Δ denotes the forward difference operator $\Delta x(i) = x(i+1) - x(i)$; for any $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ we put $Z[a, b] = \{a, a+1, \dots, b-1, b\}$. Problem (1) as given above is in a variational form so that we may apply the critical point theory in order to reach the existence of solutions for which we use the direct variational method. In order to get the multiplicity of solutions we combine the mountain pass methodology with the direct variational approach.

Discrete boundary value problems have attracted a lot of attention recently. The boundary value problems connected with discrete equations can be tackled with almost similar methods as their continuous counterparts. The variational techniques applied for discrete problems include, among others, the mountain pass methodology, the linking theorem, the Morse theory, the three critical point, compare with [2], [3], [6], [7], [8]. Moreover, the fixed point approach is in fact much more prolific in the case of discrete problem, see for example [1], [4]. However the results concerning the higher order problems are rather scarce, see [9]. Mostly in the literature the second and fourth order problems are considered.

2 Variational framework

Solutions are obtained in the space

$$E = \{x : Z[1-n, N+n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} | (\forall i \in Z[1-n, 0] \cup Z[N+1, N+n])(x(i) = 0)\}$$

considered with a norm

$$||x|| = \left(\sum_{k=1}^N x(k)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

All functions form E are defined on a finite set, and therefore these are continuous. The space E can be also considered with the following norm

$$||x||_q = \left(\sum_{k=1}^N |x(k)|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \quad (2)$$

where $q \geq 1$. Since E has finite dimension any norms $||\cdot||_1, ||\cdot||_2$ are equivalent, i.e. there exist constants c, C such that inequality

$$c||x||_1 \leq ||x||_2 \leq C||x||_1$$

holds for all $x \in E$.

The action functional which we use $J : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ reads

$$J(x) = \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2} p(k) (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right]$$

where $F(k, s) = \int_0^s f(k, t) dt$. Critical points of J are in fact solution to (1) and

in turn solutions to (1) are precisely critical points to J . The solutions which we investigate are the strong ones. This is in contrast to the infinite dimensional case, when the critical point theory allows usually for obtaining weak solutions.

Lemma 1 *J is continously differentiable in the sense of Gateux; $x_0 \in E$ is a solution to (1) if and only if it is critical point to J .*

Proof. Fix $x \in E$ and chose an arbitrary direction $h \in E$. Let us define an auxiliary function $\varphi_x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\varphi_x(\varepsilon) = J(x + \varepsilon h) = \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2} p(k) (\Delta^n x(k) + \Delta^n(\varepsilon h)(k))^2 - F(k, x(k) + (\varepsilon h)(k)) \right].$$

Its derivative at 0 is equal to derivative of J at point x and direction h

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi'_x(0) &= p(k) \sum_{k=1-n}^N \Delta^n x(k) \Delta^n h(k) - \sum_{k=1-n}^N f(k, x(k)) h(k) = \\ &\sum_{k=1-n}^N (p(k) \Delta^n x(k) \Delta^n h(k) - f(k, x(k)) h(k)).\end{aligned}$$

Using summation by parts formula, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k=1-n}^N p(k) \Delta^n x(k) \Delta^n h(k) = \\ &[p(k-1) \Delta^n x(k-1) \Delta^{n-1} h(k)]_{1-n}^{N+1} - \sum_{k=1-n}^N \Delta (p(k-1) \Delta^n x(k-1)) \Delta^{n-1} h(k) = \\ &- \sum_{k=1-n}^N \Delta (p(k-1) \Delta^n x(k-1)) \Delta^{n-1} h(k) = \\ &- \left([\Delta (p(k-2) \Delta^n x(k-2)) \Delta^{n-2} h(k)]_{1-n}^{N+1} - \sum_{k=1-n}^N \Delta^2 (p(k-2) \Delta^n x(k-2)) \Delta^{n-2} h(k) \right) = \\ &\sum_{k=1-n}^N \Delta^2 (p(k-2) \Delta^n x(k-2)) \Delta^{n-2} h(k) = (-1)^n \sum_{k=1-n}^N \Delta^n (p(k-n) \Delta^n x(k-n)) h(k).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore J is of class C^1 . Thus

$$\varphi'_x(0) = \sum_{k=1-n}^N ((-1)^n \Delta^n (p(k-n) \Delta^n x(k-n)) h(k) - f(k, x(k)) h(k)) = (J'(x), h)$$

and $\varphi'_x(0) = 0$ provides that

$$\sum_{k=1-n}^N [\Delta^n (p(k-n) \Delta^n x(k-n)) h(k) + (-1)^{n+1} f(k, x(k)) h(k)] = 0.$$

Thus the second assertion follows. ■

3 Auxiliary results

Now we provide some results which will be used in the sequel. Let us recall some definitions and lemmas.

Definition 2 ([5]) *Let H be a Banach space. We say that functional $J : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is coercive on H , if $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} J(x) = +\infty$, where $\|\cdot\|$ stands for norm in H .*

Definition 3 ([5]) Let $J \in C^1(H, \mathbb{R})$, where H is real Banach space. If for any sequence $\{u_n\} \subset H$, such that $\{J(u_n)\}$ is bounded and $J'(u_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, (u_n) possesses a convergent subsequence, then we say that J satisfies Palais-Smale condition or (PS) condition for short.

In search for critical points we will use the following lemmas:

Lemma 4 ([5]) If the functional $J : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is continuous and coercive, then there exists $x_0 \in H$ such that $\inf_{x \in H} J(x) = J(x_0)$. If J is Gateaux differentiable at x_0 , $J'(x_0) = \theta$.

Lemma 5 ([5]) (Mountain-pass lemma) Let H be a real Banach space, and $J \in C^1(H, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy the (PS) condition. Assume that $x_0, x_1 \in H$ and $\Omega \subset H$ is an open set such that $x_0 \in \Omega$, but $x_1 \notin \Omega$. If $\max\{J(x_0), J(x_1)\} < \inf_{x \in \partial\Omega} J(x)$, then $c = \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t))$ is the critical value of J , where

$$\Gamma = \{h|h : [0, 1] \rightarrow H, h \text{ is continuous}, h(0) = x_0, h(1) = x_1\}$$

It means that there exist $x^* \in H$ such that $J(x^*) = c$ and $J'(x^*) = \theta$.

We may also use mountain pass lemma in following variant

Lemma 6 Let H be a real Banach space, and $J \in C^1(H, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy the (PS) condition. Assume that $x_0, x_1 \in H$ and $\Omega \subset H$ is an open set such that $x_0 \in \Omega$, but $x_1 \notin \Omega$. If $\min\{J(x_0), J(x_1)\} > \sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} J(x)$, then $c = \sup_{h \in \Gamma} \min_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t))$ is the critical value of J . It means that there exist $x^* \in H$ such that $J(x^*) = c$ and $J'(x^*) = \theta$.

since functional J satisfies assumptions of mountain pass lemma if and only if $-J$ satisfies assumptions of its second variant, and since critical points of J and $-J$ are mutually corresponding.

We will also use the following inequality from [9]

$$\lambda \|x\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1-n}^N (\Delta^n x(k))^2 \leq 4^n \|x\|^2$$

4 Case of nonnegative p

We know that the direct method of the calculus of variations can be summarized as follows: given a continuously differentiable coercive functional we know that it has at least one critical point. Since we know that our functional is already of class C^1 , it suffices to provide conditions which will guarantee the coercivity or anti-coercivity of J . In case of finite dimensional setting we can employ either coercivity or anti-coercivity of the action functional. Thus we have the following sequence of lemmas.

Lemma 7 *We assume either that*

A1 *there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$, such that $xf(k, x) \leq 0$ for all $k \in Z[1, N]$, and $|x| > \alpha$.*

or that

A2.1 *there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha < \frac{1}{2}\lambda \min p(k)$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \leq \alpha u^2$,*

or that

A2.2 *there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq q < 2$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \leq \alpha|u|^q$.*

Then J is coercive and problem (1) has at least one solution.

Proof. By **A1** we see that $x \rightarrow F(k, x)$ are bounded from the above for $k = 1, \dots, N$. Indeed, fix $k \in Z[1, N]$. We observe that $f(k, x) \leq 0$ for $x > \alpha$. Thus for $x > \alpha$ function $x \rightarrow F(k, x)$ is nonincreasing. Hence $\limsup_{x \rightarrow +\infty} F(k, x) < +\infty$. In order to prove the boundness for $x < -\alpha$ we put $h(k, x) = f(k, -x)$ and repeat our reasoning. Since for $x \in [-\alpha, \alpha]$, function $x \rightarrow F(k, x)$ being continuous is bounded we see that there exists a constant $m > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \min_{k \in Z[1-n, N]} p(k) \sum_{k=1-n}^N (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) \geq \\ &\frac{1}{2} \lambda \min_{k \in Z[1-n, N]} p(k) \|x\|^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda \min_{k \in Z[1-n, N]} p(k) \|x\|^2 - m. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore J is coercive and so problem (1) has a solution.

Assuming either **A2.1** or **A2.2** we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1-n}^N [\frac{1}{2} p(k) (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k))] &\geq \sum_{k=1-n}^N [\frac{1}{2} \min p(k) (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k))] = \\ \frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \sum_{k=1-n}^N (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) &\geq \\ \frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \sum_{k=1-n}^N (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N \alpha |x(k)|^q &= \frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \lambda \|x\|^2 - \alpha \|x\|_q^q \geq \\ \frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \lambda \|x\|^2 - \alpha C^q \|x\|^q \end{aligned}$$

Where $\|\cdot\|_q$ is defined by (2) and C is constant such that for every $x \in E$ inequality $\|x\|_q \leq C\|x\|$ holds. When $1 \leq q < 2$ we see that the expression

$$\frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \lambda \|x\|^2 - \alpha C^q \|x\|^q$$

approaches $+\infty$ as $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$. When $q = 2$ and $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}\lambda \min p(k)$, we see that

$$(\frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \lambda - \alpha) \|x\|^2 \rightarrow +\infty$$

since $(\frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \lambda - \alpha) > 0$. ■

The existence results we can also get in case when the action functional is anti-coercive. Indeed, we have the following result similar in spirit to Lemma 7.

Lemma 8 *We assume either that*

A3.1 *there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \geq \alpha u^2$*

or that

A3.2 *there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha > 0, q > 2$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \geq \alpha |u|^q$.*

Then J is anti-coercive and problem (1) has at least one solution.

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n \|x\|^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) \leq \\ &\frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n \|x\|^2 - \alpha \sum_{k=1-n}^N |x(k)|^q = \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n \|x\|^2 - \alpha (\|x\|_q)^q \leq \\ &\frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n \|x\|^2 - \alpha c^q \|x\|^q. \end{aligned}$$

If $q > 2$ we see that

$$\frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n \|x\|^2 - \alpha c^q \|x\|^q$$

approaches $-\infty$ as $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$ since $\alpha \geq 0$. When $q = 2$ and $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$ we see that

$$J(x) \leq \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n \|x\|^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n - \alpha \right) \|x\|^2 \rightarrow -\infty$$

■

5 Case of p non-positive

In this case the existence follows with similar methods as in the previous case. We provide the results with only sketched proofs.

Lemma 9 *We assume either that*

B1 *there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$, such that $xf(k, x) \geq 0$ for all $k \in Z[1, N]$, and $|x| > \alpha$.*

or that

B2.1 *there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha > \frac{1}{2}4^n \max p(k)$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \geq \alpha u^2$,*

or that

B2.2 there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \leq q < 2$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \geq \alpha|u|^q$.

Then J is anticoercive and problem (1) has at least one solution.

Proof. We consider functional

$$\begin{aligned} K(x) = -J(x) &= - \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2}p(k)(\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right] = \\ &= \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2}(-p(k))(\Delta^n x(k))^2 - (-F(k, x(k))) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We see that K , with $p' = -p$ and $G = -F$ satisfy **A1**. Since in finite dimensional space every x is a critical point of J if and only if it is a critical point of K we get assertion.

Assuming either **B2.1** or **B2.2** we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2}p(k)(\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right] &\leq \frac{1}{2} \max p(k) \sum_{k=1-n}^N (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \max p(k) 4^n \|x\|^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \max p(k) 4^n \|x\|^2 - \alpha c^q \|x\|^q. \end{aligned}$$

When $1 \leq q < 2$ we see, that right side of inequality approaches $-\infty$. If $q = 2$ and $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k) 4^n$, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \max p(k) 4^n \|x\|^2 - \alpha \|x\|^2$$

also approaches $-\infty$, since $\frac{1}{2} \max p(k) 4^n - \alpha < 0$. ■

Lemma 10 We assume either that

B3.1 there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha < \frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \lambda$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \leq \alpha u^2$

or that

B3.2 there exist constants $M \geq 0, \alpha < 0, q > 2$ such that for all $|u| > M$ it holds $F(k, u) \leq \alpha|u|^q$,

Then J is coercive and problem (1) has at least one solution.

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &= \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2}p(k)(\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right] \geq \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2} \min p(k)(\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \sum_{k=1-n}^N (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - \sum_{k=1-n}^N F(k, x(k)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min p(k) \lambda \|x\|^2 - \alpha C^q \|x\|^q \end{aligned}$$

When $q > 2$ then since $\alpha < 0$, left side of inequality approaches $+\infty$. When $q = 2$, and $\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \min p(k)\lambda$, it also approaches $+\infty$. ■

6 Case of arbitrary p

When function p has arbitrary sign we may also use the arguments applied before. For example by inequality

$$\sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2} p(k) (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right] \leq \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2} \max p(k) (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right]$$

it follows with each of the assumptions **A3.1**, **A3.2**, **B2.1**, **B2.2** that functional J is anti-coercive, and therefore (1) has a solution.

Similarly by inequality

$$\sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2} \min p(k) (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right] \leq \sum_{k=1-n}^N \left[\frac{1}{2} p(k) (\Delta^n x(k))^2 - F(k, x(k)) \right]$$

it follows with each of the assumptions **A2.1**, **A2.2**, **B3.1**, **B3.2** that functional J is coercive, and therefore (1) has a solution.

Moreover, for the purpose of the existence of at least one solution we may use one of the following conditions:

C1 there exists $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$ such that $\liminf_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k,u)}{u^2} > \alpha$ uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

C2 there exists $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$ such that $\liminf_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k,u)}{u^2} = \alpha$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

C3 there exists $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$ such that $\liminf_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k,u)}{u^2} \geq \alpha$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

C4 there exists $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$ such that $\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} (F(k, u) - \alpha u^2) = \infty$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

D1 there exists $\alpha > 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\liminf_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k,u)}{|u|^q} > \alpha$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

D2 there exists $\alpha > 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\liminf_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k,u)}{|u|^q} = \alpha$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

D3 there exists $\alpha > 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\liminf_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k,u)}{|u|^q} \geq \alpha$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

D4 there exists $\alpha > 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} (F(k, u) - \alpha |u|^q) = \infty$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

E1 there exists $\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \min p(k)\lambda$ such that $\limsup_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k,u)}{u^2} < \alpha$, uni-

formely in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

E2 there exists $\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \min p(k)\lambda$ such that $\limsup_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k, u)}{u^2} = \alpha$, uni-

formely in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

E3 there exists $\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \min p(k)\lambda$ such that $\limsup_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k, u)}{u^2} \leq \alpha$, uni-

formely in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

E4 there exists $\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \min p(k)\lambda$ such that $\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} (F(k, u) - \alpha u^2) = -\infty$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

F1 there exists $\alpha < 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\limsup_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k, u)}{|u|^q} < \alpha$, uniformly

in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

F2 there exists $\alpha < 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\limsup_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k, u)}{|u|^q} = \alpha$, uniformly

in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

F3 there exists $\alpha < 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\limsup_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(k, u)}{|u|^q} \leq \alpha$, uniformly

in $k \in Z[1, N]$,

F4 there exists $\alpha < 0$, $q > 2$ such that $\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} (F(k, u) - \alpha |u|^q) = -\infty$, uniformly in $k \in Z[1, N]$.

We have the following

Lemma 11 *Assume any of the above conditions. Then problem (1) has at least one solution.*

Proof. When **C1** is satisfied we use the definition of the lower limit in order to get

$$(\exists \Delta > 0)(\forall u)(|u| > \Delta \Rightarrow \frac{F(k, u)}{u^2} > \alpha)$$

and further

$$(\forall u)(|u| > \Delta \Rightarrow F(k, u) > \alpha u^2)$$

Thus there exist $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$, $\Delta > 0$ such that for $|u| > \Delta$, $F(k, u) > \alpha u^2$. So **A3.1** holds and the assertion follows by Lemma (8). When **C2** holds it suffice to apply **C1** with $\alpha' = \frac{\alpha}{2}$. **C3** follows by any of **C1** or **C2**. Assuming **C4** we

fix $M > 0$ and find $\Delta > 0$ such that for all $|u| > \Delta$ it holds $F(k, u) - \alpha u^2 > M$. Thus there exist $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k)4^n$, Δ such that $|u| > \Delta$, $F(k, u) > \alpha u^2 + M$. So again **A3.1** holds and the assertion follows by Lemma (8).

When **D1** is satisfied we use the definition of lower limit in order to get

$$(\exists \Delta > 0)(\forall u)(|u| > \Delta \Rightarrow \frac{F(k, u)}{|u|^q} > \alpha)$$

and then

$$(\forall u)(|u| > \Delta \Rightarrow F(k, u) > \alpha |u|^q)$$

Thus there exist $\alpha > 0$, $\Delta > 0$ such that for $|u| > \Delta$, $F(k, u) > \alpha|u|^q$ where $q > 2$. Hence **A3.2** holds and the assertion follows by Lemma (8). In similar way as in previous case we obtain, that **D2**, **D3** provide coercitivity of J . Assuming **D4** we fix $M > 0$ and find $\Delta > 0$ such that for all $|u| > \Delta$ it holds $F(k, u) - \alpha u^2 > M$. Thus there exist $\alpha > \frac{1}{2} \max p(k) 4^n$, Δ such that $|u| > \Delta$, $F(k, u) > \alpha u^2 + M$. So again **A3.2** holds and the assertion follows by Lemma (8).

Similar as in previous cases we obtain that there exist $\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \lambda \min p(k)$, $\Delta > 0$ such that for $|u| > \Delta$, $F(k, u) < \alpha u^2$. So **B3.1** holds and the assertion follows by Lemma (10).

E4. Fix $M < 0$. Using definition of upper limit, there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that for each u , if $|u| > \Delta$, then $F(k, u) - \alpha u^2 < M$. Therefore assumption **B3.1** is satisfied and functional J is coercive.

When **F1** is satisfied we use definition of upper limit in order to get

$$(\exists \Delta > 0)(\forall u)(|u| > \Delta \Rightarrow \frac{F(k, u)}{|u|^q} < \alpha)$$

and then

$$(\forall u)(|u| > \Delta \Rightarrow F(k, u) < \alpha|u|^q)$$

So **B3.2** is satisfied. To prove **F4** fix $M < 0$. Using the definition of upper limit we obtain, that there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that for each u , if $|u| > \Delta$, then $F(k, u) < M + \alpha|u|^q$. Therefore assumption **B3.2** is satisfied and functional J is coercive. ■

7 Existence of a second solution

In this section we follow the reasoning applied in [9]. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 12 *Assume that any of the conditions **A3.1**, **A3.2**, **B2.1**, **B2.2** holds, and that $\max_{k \in Z[1, N]} \lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(k, u)}{u} \leq c < \min p(k) \lambda$. Then (1) has at least two solutions.*

Proof. Since J is anti-coercive and since E is finite dimensional, it follows that J satisfies the (PS) condition. Let $\varepsilon = \frac{\min p(k) \lambda - c}{2}$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for $|u| < \delta$ we have $\frac{f(k, u)}{u} \leq c + \varepsilon = \frac{\min p(k) \lambda + c}{2}$. Hence for $|u| < \delta$, $\int_0^u f(k, s) ds \leq \frac{\min p(k) \lambda + c}{2} \int_0^u s ds = \frac{\min p(k) \lambda + c}{4} u^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda \|x\|^2 - \min_{k \in Z[1-n, N]} p(k) - \sum_{k=1-n}^N \frac{\min p(k) \lambda + c}{4} x(k)^2 = \\ &\frac{1}{2} \lambda \|x\|^2 - \min_{k \in Z[1-n, N]} p(k) - \frac{\min p(k) \lambda + c}{4} \|x\|^2 = \\ &(\frac{1}{2} \lambda - \min_{k \in Z[1-n, N]} p(k) - \frac{\min p(k) \lambda + c}{4}) \|x\|^2 = \frac{\min p(k) \lambda - c}{4} \|x\|^2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $J(x) \geq \frac{\min p(k)\lambda - c}{4}\delta^2 > 0 = J(\theta)$ for $x \in \partial\{x \in E : \|x\| < \delta\}$. Since $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} J(x) \rightarrow -\infty$ we easily find $x_0 \in \Omega = E \setminus \{x \in E : \|x\| \leq \delta\}$ such that $J(x_0) < 0$. In a consequence Ω , θ , x , x_0 satisfy the assumptions of the mountain pass lemma. Thus there exists a critical point $\bar{x}$ such that $J(\bar{x}) = \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t))$. We know by anti-coercivity that there exists $x^* \in E$ such that $J(x^*) = \max_{x \in E} J(x)$. When $x^* \neq \bar{x}$ we reach the assertion of the theorem.

Suppose that $x^* = \bar{x}$. It means that $J(x^*) = \inf_{h \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t))$. Hence for any function $h \in \Gamma$, $\max_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t)) = J(x^*)$. Indeed, for any $h \in \Gamma$ we have $J(x^*) \geq \max_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t))$ since $J(x^*) = \max_{x \in E} J(x)$ and $J(x^*) \leq \max_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t))$ by definition of the infimum. Since $N > 1$, the space $E \setminus \{x^*\}$ is path-connected being homeomorphic with $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{c\}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Hence, there exists a function $h_0 \in \Gamma$ such that $h_0(t) \neq x^*$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Since $\max_{t \in [0,1]} J(h_0(t)) = J(x^*)$ it follows that there exists $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $J(h_0(t_0)) = \max_{x \in E} J(x)$ and $h_0(t_0) \neq x^*$ by the definition of h_0 . Thus $h_0(t_0)$ is a critical point different than x^* . ■

Using the second variant of the mountain pass theorem and using the methodology employed in the proof of Theorem (12) we reach the following result.

Theorem 13 *Assume that any of the conditions **B3.1**, **B3.2**, **A2.1**, **A2.2** holds, and that $\min_{k \in Z[1, \dots, N]} \lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(k, u)}{u} \geq c > \max p(k)4^n$. Then (1) has at least two solutions.*

Proof. Taking $\varepsilon = \frac{c - \max p(k)}{2}$ we obtain, that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for $|u| < \delta$ we have $\frac{f(k, u)}{u} \geq c + \varepsilon = \frac{\max p(k)4^n + c}{2}$. Hence for $|u| < \delta$, $\int_0^u f(k, s) ds \leq \frac{\max p(k)4^n + c}{2} \int_0^u s ds = \frac{\max p(k)4^n + c}{4} u^2$ and

$$J(x) \leq \|x\|^2 \cdot \frac{\max p(k)4^n - c}{4} < 0$$

For $x \in \partial\{x \in E : \|x\| < \delta\}$. Since $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} J(x) \rightarrow +\infty$ we easily find $x_0 \in \Omega = E \setminus \{x \in E : \|x\| \leq \delta\}$ such that $J(x_0) > 0$. In a consequence Ω , θ , x , x_0 satisfy the assumptions of the second variant of mountain pass lemma. Thus there exists a critical point $\bar{x}$ such that $J(\bar{x}) = \sup_{h \in \Gamma} \min_{t \in [0,1]} J(h(t))$. We know by coercivity that there exists $x^* \in E$ such that $J(x^*) = \min_{x \in E} J(x)$. Using the same reasoning as in previous case, we obtain existence of second solution. ■

References

- [1] R.P. Agarwal, D. O'Regan, A fixed-point approach for nonlinear discrete boundary value problems, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 36, No.10-12, 115-121, (1998).

- [2] R.P. Agarwal, K. Perera, O'Regan, Donal, Multiple positive solutions of singular discrete p -Laplacian problems via variational methods. *Adv. Difference Equ.* 2005, No. 2, 93-99, (2005).
- [3] X. Cai, J. Yu, Existence theorems of periodic solutions for second-order nonlinear difference equations. *Adv. Difference Equ.* 2008, Article ID 247071, (2008).
- [4] Y. Guo, W. Wei, Chen, Y.. Existence of three positive solutions for m -point discrete boundary value problems with p -Laplacian. *Discrete Dyn. Nat. Soc.* 2009, Article ID 538431, (2009).
- [5] J. Mawhin, Problèmes de Dirichlet variationnels non linéaires, *Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal*, (1987).
- [6] Y. Tian, Z. Du and W. Ge, Existence results for discrete Sturm-Liouville problem via variational methods, *J. Difference Equ. Appl.* **13**, No. 6, 467–478, (2007).
- [7] G. Zhang, S. S. Cheng, , Existence of solutions for a nonlinear system with a parameter. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 314, No. 1, 311-319, (2006).
- [8] G. Zhang , Existence of non-zero solutions for a nonlinear system with a parameter. *Nonlinear Anal., Theory Methods Appl.* 66, No. 6, A, 1410-1416, (2007).
- [9] Q. Zou, P. Weng, Solutions of 2^n -order boundary value problem for difference equation via variational method. *Adv. Difference Equ.*, Article ID 730484, (2009).